DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 333 541 EA 023 036

AUTHOR Seeley, David S.
TITLE Brother Can You Paradigm? Finding a Banner around Which To Rally in Restructuring Schools.
PUB DATE Apr 91
NOTE 46p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Chicago, IL, April 3-7, 1991).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Change Strategies; Collegiality; *Educational Change; *Educational Cooperation; Educational Objectives; Educational Trends; Elementary Secondary Education; *Models; Participative Decision Making; Perspective Taking; Resistance to Change; School Choice; *School Restructuring

ABSTRACT

After clarifying the meaning of restructuring through an analysis of the current educational paradigm, this document begins by differentiating between educational reform and restructuring and, similarly, between educational evolution and revolution. Paradigms are defined along with Kuhn's (1962) concept of the "paradigm shift." Clarifying, justifying, and implementing educational paradigm shifts are discussed as well as ways to expedite the shifting process. Next, the origin, nature, potential, and shortcomings of four proposed paradigm shifts in public education are described: (1) a voucher proposal involving a shift from a governmental or delegation model to a market system; (2) a "deschooling" paradigm that involves moving education outside public school buildings; (3) a results paradigm that holds outcomes, rather than process, to be crucial; and (4) a shift from educational bureaucracy to collaboration. The need for a common educational vision or "banner around which to rally" is discussed, with collaboration presented as a necessary component of any new paradigm. Last, the trend toward a paradigm that emphasizes providing success for all over separating winners from losers is reviewed, and the interrelated moves toward partnership and success for all are described as a dual paradigm shift. (22 references) (CLA)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED333541

BROTHER, CAN YOU PARADIGM?

Finding a Banner Around Which to Rally in Restructuring Schools

David S. Seeley©

College of Staten Island/City University of New York

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

D. Seeley

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association

Chicago, IL
April 4, 1991

EA023036

CONTENTS

I.	Paradigm Analysis is needed for clarifying restructuring	1
	Reform vs. Restructuring	1
	Evolution vs. Revolution	2
	Paradigms and Paradigm Shifts	3
	Learning How to "Paradigm"	6
	Hurrying the Paradigm Shift-Along	7
II.	Four Proposed Paradigm Shifts in Public Education	11
	Vouchers: From Government to Market	11
	Deschooling: From Schooling to Education	12
	Results: From Prossess to Outcomes	15
	Partnership: From Bureaucracy to Collaboration	21
III.	Finding A Banner Around Which to Rally	30
	Collaboration	31
	Success for All	33
	Partnership and Success for All as a Dual Shift.	37

David S. Seeley
College of Staten Island
130 Stuyvesant Place
Staten Island, N.Y. 10301
718 390-7982

BROTHER, CAN YOU PARADIGM?
Finding a Banner Around Which to Rally in Restructuring Schools

David S. Seeley ©
College of Staten Island. City University of New York

I. PARADIGM ANALYSIS IS NEEDED FOR CLARIFYING RESTRUCTURING

"Restructure"-babble has gotten out of hand--to the point of endangering the most important educational reform since the founding of public education in the United States. Although hardly used at all ten years ago, "restructure" and "restructuring" is now used for such a wide range of school reforms as to be almost meaningless.

Why is this dangerous? That so many people are talking about "restructuring" public education is highly significant--and positive--since, as we shall see, it reflects what by now has become a national movement for fundamental reform of the system. Nonetheless, without greater clarity about what "restructuring" means, there is a high risk that this important movement will fail.

Reform vs. Restructuring

Some of us who have advocated "restructuring" public education have used the term "restructure" to distinguish between changes in public education's underlying policy framework which fundamentally alter the roles and relationships of the participants, and reforms and improvements which, however beneficial they may be, do not involve these kinds of fundamental changes.

But this has not clarified the distinction well enough, since many reforms can be called "restructuring" which do not involve changes in the underlying policy framework or in the roles and relationships of the participants. Shifting from an 8-4 to a 6-3-3 grade structure, for instance, or keeping the schools open until 6 p.m. can be called a "restructuring" of the school system even if they involve no fundamental changes of this sort. They might be proposed simply as a way to make better use of available buildings or to accommodate an after-school program.

Why is it important to make this distinction? Because the kinds of arguments and efforts needed to gain acceptance of changes in the underlying policy framework and in the fundamental roles and relationships of the participants are different from those required for less fundamental reforms. Even more important: the process of change and the strategies for implementation are different between these two types of reform.

Some of the most serious confusions in current educational policy debate, decision-making, and implementation come from the failure to recognize this distinction. People often evaluate the merits of restructuring on the basis of the current policy framework (e.g. "shared decision-making" violates the "chain of command" and "accountability"), when the proposed reform is based on a different framework, and it is therefore competing frameworks (e.g. existing concepts of authority and accountability versus new ones) which should be examined and debated, not whether the new proposal fits within the old framework, since by definition it doesn't.

The need to understand these characteristics of fundamental restructuring is even more important in the implementation of restructuring than in debating or discussing it. Many current programs to "restructure" schools, through such efforts as "school-based management," "shared decision-making," "professionalization of teaching," etc., are floundering and in danger of failing and discrediting the whole restructuring movement because of failure to understand and respond appropriately to the nature of this type of fundamental change as distinguished from more traditional reforms.

Evolution vs. Revolution

In addition to using "restructuring" instead of "reform," another effort to make the distinction has been to refer to restructuring reforms as "revolutionary." But this has had problems too, since it suggests a sudden and simultaneous overturning of the status quo and establishment of a new order, and this both frightens people unnecessarily and gives an unrealistic picture of the necessarily long time school restructuring will take.

Few of us who have been advocating restructuring see anything but a slow and gradual process for converting public schools from what they are today to new and fundamentally different kinds of institutions with very different goals, relationships, and procedures. The decentralized nature and "loose coupling" of the American public school system, the comprehensiveness of the changes required in many different components of the system, and the changes in mindsets needed to make the restructured system work, will make such gradualism unavoidable. In this sense, these fundamental changes must necessarily be "evolutionary."

Among efforts to restructure public school systems, Chicago's 1988 school reform law comes closest to being "revolutionary" in terms of the suddenness of its governance change, in that all of the more than 500 schools in the system were legislated to have new school governing councils at the same time and on very short notice. But even there, this all-at-once change was only in the governance structure; the actual conversion of each school to a significantly

different kind of institution with different internalized goals and fundamental changes in the relationships among the participants and in the teaching-learning process for achieving the new goals, will take a number of years to accomplish.

The more extreme proposals for educational vouchers--e.g. $5000 vouchers provided to allow every school child totally free choice of schools next fall--could, if enacted, also cause something like revolutionary change fairly quickly. But that is one reason why such a voucher plan has not yet been enacted. Although the voucher concept itself is radical, as will be discussed below, its implementation is likely to be more partial, gradual, and experimental (e.g, much smaller vouchers, limitation to certain children or localities, restrictions on choice, etc.) than the full-fledged, instant model.

In general, then, most restructuring is not likely to be "revolutionary" in the usual sense of the word, and this term is not much help in clarifying educational restructuring.

Paradigms and Paradigm Shifts

In one important sense, however, even this slow and gradual process of fundamentally restructuring of roles, relationships and goals of public education can and should be thought as "revolutionary" --namely in the sense involved in the concept of "paradigm shifts": This concept, derived from science historian Thomas Kuhn's famous essay, The Structure of Scientific Revolutions (1962), is increasingly being used to understand the nature of shifts in institutions and belief systems which, although they may take place gradually, involve fundamental changes in basic assumptions, mental images, rules of behavior, values and relationships.

What is a "paradigm"? Origingally from the Greek word for pattern, it has come to have a number of meanings: a conceptual model (e.g. Copernicus' sun-centered model of the solar system), a basic principle, assumption or definition, formula, premise, etc., as well as the larger cluster of values, beliefs, formulas, etc. that make up the "world-view" or "mindset" of a group, institution or policy-making community. [1]

If this seems almost as confusing as the many meanings of "restructuring" itself, there is a common thread that runs through the various meanings of "paradigm" when used in connection with "paradigm shift": the connotation of being underlying or basic--of being the foundation (often unconscious or taken-for-granted) on which many other concepts, relationships, rules, policies, behaviors or world views are based.

A "paradigm shift" means a change in underlying assumptions, premises, definitions, etc., which, because what is changed is underlying and fundamental, causes many other things to change

too. Thinking of the world as round instead of flat creates a whole new "world view" with many implications for human behavior and policy beside changes in navigational practices. Kuhn speaks of paradigm shifts as bringing about "significant shifts in the criteria determining the legitimacy of both problems and or proposed solutions"--in which "scientists are responding to a different world," and for which they "must be re-educated" so they can "see a new gestalt." [2]

In the Copernicus example, astronomers before him took for granted that the planets circled around the earth, and they spent their time not in reexamining that basic premise, but in making observations and calculations based upon it. Copernicus urged them to reconsider their basic conceptual model or mental picture of the solar system and to replace it with the sun-centered model. This of course would required them to re-do all their calculations and methodologies to conform to the new model, which is one of the reasons the shift was resisted for so long. It also required them to give up or radically shift their "mindset" regarding the relationship between science and religious doctrine, since for many, the earth-centered model was an article of religion. This is another reason why the new model was resisted, and a good example of how the complex, interrelated nature of human belief systems can make paradigm shifts extremely difficult.

Why is Kuhn's analysis of paradigm shifts useful in considering school restructuring? Let's admit at the start that the educational policy community (if it can be considered a "community" at all since it involves so many different kinds of people with different roles, professions, and backgrounds) is very different from the kind of scientific communities Kuhn was talking about--a group of scientists whose a common education and socialization into their field gives them a set of shared definitions, beliefs, values, methods, etc, (a "disciplinary matrix") that enable them to communicate with each other and carry on their normal business of scientific research (what Kuhn calls "normal science"). Furthermore, the process of educational policy-making (or any kind of policy-making) is quite different from scientific research in that it is an effort to decide "what should be" rather than to describe "what is," i.e. it is normative rather than empirical. The criteria for a good social (or educational) policy are different from those for a good scientific theory. [3]

Nevertheless, despite these differences, what has intrigued people about Kuhn's analysis is that there seem to be behaviors in non-scientific communities that are similar to the kind of behavior that Kuhn studied in the history of science when a community of scientists is confronted with a challenge to, or change in, one or more key components of their accepted belief system, i.e. a "paradigm shift." As Marilyn Ferguson points out, "Kuhn's ideas are enormously helpful, not only because they help us understand how a new perspective emerges, but also how and why such new views are

invariably resisted for a time." [4] He helps explain how the great psychological and institutional investment people have in their existing paradigms (often unconscious) often prevents them from being willing, or even able, to consider and adopt new paradigms.

Some of the current arguments against various restructuring proposals, for instance, can be compared to people arguing against Columbus sailing west because the world is flat. Given their fixed assumption about the shape of the world, their their inability to see what he was proposing was understandable. But, since Columbus was planning his trip on the basis of a different assumption, their arguments were beside the point.

As it turned out Columbus's own assumptions were faulty as well: The world was much bigger than he assumed (as some astronomers of the day tried to tell him) and there were a couple of continents between Europe and China that he didn't know about. But, luckily for the opening of the Age of Exploration, Columbus acted on his only partly correct assumptions. And luckier still, he persisted long enough to make his momentous discoveries. If he had given up and returned home when he failed to reach land by the time his too-small world model told him he should, his basic assumption about the roundness of the world would no doubt have been discredited, and European navigators might have stuck to their eastward routes around Africa for many more years.

This little homily in honor of the quincentennial of Columbus' journey suggests a number of things about paradigm-shift reforms which distinguish them in important ways from more typical reforms: (1) The conceptual model on which they are based is often quite sketchy, conceived differently by different people, and sometimes seriously flawed. (2) They often require an act of faith, partly because of the sketchiness of the model, but also because there's no way of proving ahead of time that the new model is better than the old one, or even that it will work at all. (3) In order to succeed, they often require comprehensive changes in many different components of the institution or system being changed. (Columbus' success required developments in ship building, navigation, economic conditions, Muslim take-over of overland trade routes, etc. Educational restructuring will require changes in roles, relationships, accountability systems, teaching methods, teacher and administrator training, etc. in order to work properly. Trying to change just one of these things while the rest of the system remains unrestructured may just cause confusion rather than improvement.) (4) Fundamental restructuring requires persistence; it take a long time, and because of the characteristics discussed above, it often results in mistakes and backsliding. (5) It is important for at least the leaders (and in school reform there are many leaders, both formal and informal) to have a conceptual model in mind, and to be able to sell it to whomever needs to buy it for the reform to succeed.

Kuhn's analysis is useful and important for helping us understand many other aspects of educational "restructuring": why proposals for restructuring public education are emerging, why there is such an upswing in discussions of "paradigm shifts," and also why there is often such resistance to the new proposed paradigms--such inability even to understand what they are about, or even to think about them. By helping us understand paradigm shifts, as Ferguson points out, Kuhn's analysis also suggests how we might deal with them: "Now that we are beginning to understand the dynamics of revolutionary insights, we can learn to foster our own healthy change of mind without waiting for the fever of a crisis." [5]

Learning How to "Paradigm"

If we are going to start taking paradigm shifts seriously as a guide to educational policy, we will have to do three things that educational policy discussions seldom do: We will have to (1) clarify what paradigms are being talked about that have to "shift," (2) spell out why the new paradigm is better than the old one, (3) explain how the shift can be brought about. In other words, the education policy community is going to have to "learn how to paradigm."

Clarifying paradigm shifts. Although the term "paradigm shift" is increasingly used in educational policy discourse, the actual "shift" is seldom explained. If we are being asked to shift from an old paradigm to a new and better one, what actually is the old paradigm, and what is the new one? Often we are really being asked to adopt a new policy, practice, or program, and are told that it represents a "paradigm shift" (and therefore we had better get with it!), but the actual shifts in underlying assumptions, definitions, conceptual models, etc. aren't spelled out.

It's almost as if Copernicus had tried to urge his fellow astronomers to use the new calculations he derived from using his new model of the solar system, without explaining the new model they were based on. This would be considered very bizarre behavior in science and no doubt would have delayed the acceptance of his ideas even longer--or killed them altogether. But something like that is what we seem to be doing in educational policy today--arguing about different policies and practices based on different conceptual models (e.g. "school-based management") without adequately defining or debating about the conceptual models involved.

Justifying the Paradigm Shift. In addition to spelling out the paradigms being compared, we will also have to debate the merits of the competing paradigms, as paradigms, and not just discuss the merits of individual proposed programs, policies or actions based upon them. Since paradigms are underlying premises and policy frameworks, and paradigm shifts will have all sorts of implications for changes in a wide range of policies and practices based on the respective competing

paradigms, the debate must address these whole systems of policy and practice and not just individual actions, practices and programs. What are the consequences of shifting to the new paradigm? What effects would it have on the meaning of various terms, on the solution of various problems, on the various policies and practices that are dependent on the old paradigm? Are the costs involved in making the shift worth it?

We must also be prepared to answer what criteria should be used in deciding which paradigm is "superior" and why these criteria are justified. How are these criteria similar to or different from the criteria used in evaluating the relative merits of a scientific paradigm?

Implementing Paradigm Shifts. It's not enough to explain what shift should be made and why it is justified theoretically. A proponent must also be prepared to show how it could be brought about. Are the difficulties of making the shift anything like the difficulties Kuhn sees in making scientific paradigm shifts? Does this give us any clues as to how we might deal with these difficulties?

Implementing a paradigm shift in social or educational policy, involves at least two types of concern: (1) Getting people to accept the new paradigm--the new way of thinking or mindset, since this is notoriously difficult. Depending on the policy and institutional context, it may be enough in the beginning for a few leaders to pioneer the changes, with others following in time. But with some changes like school restructuring, which involves changes in the behavior and mindsets of literally millions of people, the paradigm shift ultimately must be acceptable in some form on a broad basis. (2) Assuming people accept the new paradigm, how can the actual changes in behavior, roles, relationships, or whatever else the new paradigm calls for, be brought about?

Hurrying the Paradigm Shift Along

Do we really have to answer all these questions to have a successful paradigm shift? The answer is no: The human race shifted from hunting and gathering to agriculture with the millions of "decision-makers" involved in making this shift not necessarily knowing they were making a paradigm shift and not having a model in their heads of what an agricultural society would look like. Likewise in the shift from agriculture to industry, in the shift from the horse and buggy age to the automobile age, etc. Thousands of people made their decisions about planting grain, building walls, opening or working in factories, buying cars, moving to the suburbs, etc., based on what seemed practical and desirable at the time without any paradigm analysis, and after a period of such decisions, we can look back and say a huge paradigm shift had occurred: after the shift

people were conducting their lives on substantially different assumptions, principles, definitions, values, world views, etc.

So we could drop all this talk about paradigm shifts and how they work and simply wait for whatever paradigm shift is underway to occur--and then let historians write it about it afterward. And indeed that is exactly what the great majority of teachers, parents, students, administrators, and citizens have been doing about the momentous paradigm choices now confronting American education, for it is human nature for most people to do what seems practical or desirable from the alternatives immediately before them--or even just to follow old habits even if they don't seem practical or desirable--without giving much thought to underlying assumptions, definitions, values, etc., i.e. paradigms and paradigm shifts.

The problem, of course, is time. An important question in any policy area is not only whether a paradigm shift is needed but whether there is any urgency about making it. If there is, then at least some people (policy-makers in particular and anyone who claims to be a leader) need to think through and articulate just what shift is needed and how it can be brought about in the time frame required. In other words, if urgency is involved, it is even more important for people to "learn how to paradigm."

The urgency of educational reform was recognized and articulated even before many people realized that a paradigm shift would be required to achieve it. The clarion calls about "A Nation at Risk," "unilateral educational disarmament," "a rising tide of mediocrity that threatens our very future as a Nation and a people" [6], the hundreds of commission reports, the number of state governors who have made this a top priority, the unprecedented Presidential Summit on the education crisis--all bespeak an urgency about educational reform such as has never been seen before in American history. Now that it is beginning to dawn on people that fundamental restructuring is needed to meet this crisis, a crucial question will be whether the same sense of urgency will be applied to the required paradigm shift, and, if so, what will this mean in terms of decision-making and strategies for change.

My own answer is that we cannot wait decades of muddling about in the dark not knowing what we're doing in the hope that the historical process of millions of decision-makers bumping into each other and working at cross purposes will eventually produce the needed paradigm shift in public education. In the long run we might make it, but in the long run we might all be dead.

So we had better clarify pretty quickly what sort of shift is needed and how it can be brought about, if we don't want the restructuring movement to tumble itself into confusion and subject American society to decades of chaos while more generations of young Americans continue to be mis- and under-educated.

If this seems impractical and a diversion from "the important business of improving schools," look at it this way: Policy-makers right now are faced with decisions every day about changing and reforming schools. The urgency mentioned above has pushed them into that. That so many of them have started to describe what they are doing as "restructuring" is a sign that they recognize that the reforms needed are more fundamental than usual--that it won't be enough to just do "more of the same." But how can you restructure if you don't have a concept of the new structure to be built?

Much of what we're doing now in educational restructuring is a little like Columbus proposing to set sail "in exciting new directions," without announcing any concept of what he was doing or any theory of the shape of world, but with a hope that he might discover something. This would have had the virtue of departing from the old paradigm (i.e. trying to perfect efforts to sail around Africa to get to the Far East within the confines of the old world view), so that maybe he would have bumped into something new eventually. But it is doubtful that he could ever have persuaded anyone to back his voyage on this basis, or to stick with it when the going got tough. Columbus' model may have been inaccurate, but it provided the basis for a plan of action which could mobilize the resources, manpower and persistence needed to carry it out. We need such a model in education today. Otherwise we are in danger of floundering, and leaving the field of reform to reformers who at least know what they're doing even if it's the wrong thing. [7]

Fred Hechinger once wrote that "Revolutions can succeed only if there is enough dissatisfaction with things as they are and if there is a banner around which to rally." [8] Although he didn't use the term "paradigm shifts," his statement could have come straight out of Kuhn. What we need in order to speed up and successfully implement the restructuring of public education is "a banner around which to rally." But it must be a banner <u>for the needed paradigm shift</u>, not just a label for a project or policy such as "school based management." We are getting an abundance of such labels--not only "school-based management," but "shared decision-making," "cooperative learning," "parent involvement," "teacher professionalism," etc.--all of which require basic changes in the underlying conceptual framework of public education to be fully and successfully implemented, and yet the necessary underlying conceptual framework is rarely identified, discussed or debated.

This lack is more serious for some reforms than for others. Cooperative learning and parent involvement, for instance, can begin to be implemented within the existing framework with the reorientation of mindsets occurring gradually as people get used to the new roles and relationships. But these reforms will not get very far (and haven't gotten very far) unless those sponsoring them understand their paradigm-shift aspects, and build into the implementation strategies

ways to facilitate the needed shifts in mindsets. This is even more important for reforms such as school-based management and shared decision-making which present immediate challenges to the existing structure, requiring at least some of those involved in the change to understand and accept the new underlying paradigm in order for them to work successfully.

Unfortunately, although paradigm analysis crucial for understanding and dealing with the current "restructuring" issue, I know of no one who has come up with a simple paradigm-banner "around which to rally"--nothing as clear understandable as shifting from a flat world to a round world view, or from an earth-centered to a sun-centered model of the solar system.

If we could imagine astronomers in the early part of the 16th century in a "crisis" because of the increasing complexities, contradictions and failures of their Ptolemaic calculations (thus causing "dissatisfaction with things as they are"), we could think of Copernicus' proposal for a sun-centered model as a "banner" around which he could urge his colleagues to rally. They didn't rally very fast, and many resisted mightily (Kuhn says that "Copernicanism made few converts for almost a century after Copernicus's death." [9]), but eventually more and more astronomers came to accept the sun-centered model until it became the new standard "paradigm" for studying the movement of the planets and for a new "world-view" of the universe. The simplicity of the new model and the ability of people to at least grasp the concept being proposed even if they didn't yet agree to it, no doubt facilitated its adoption. The clarity of the model also facilitated the ability of its proponents to explain how it would work and why it would be superior to the old model.

Simplicity and clarity would certainly help in explaining and advocating a new paradigm "banner" for public education. (Could our lack of such clarity help explain why so many educational policy discussions, and the reform efforts based on them, are so inconclusive and unsuccessful?)) Yet, simplicity cannot be the only criterion in seeking a new paradigm for public education. It may be that there is no simple paradigm that will fit the policy needs of an institution as complex as public education, and trying to oversimplify what is inherently complex would pull us away from a workable paradigm. [10]

What we need to find is as simple a paradigm formulation as will "fit" the realities of public education, and "work" to solve its policy problems. While there is as yet no simple "banner around which to rally" that has been agreed upon in the education community, there are a number of proposals for paradigm shifts in public education that can help us get closer to the formulation we need. Each of them, as far as I am concerned, is flawed in one way or another, but they all contain elements of what must be included in the new paradigm formulation now needed for American education.

II. FOUR PROPOSED PARADIGM SHIFTS IN PUBLIC EDUCATION

Vouchers: From Government to Market

The closest we have to a clear and simple proposed "paradigm shift" for public education in the United States is the voucher proposal. Voucher proponents have an understandable "paradigm" to propose--"the market system." While there are many different kinds of markets and all sorts of complexities in how they might operate, the basic concepts of free consumer choice, supply and demand, competition, etc. are widely understood and exemplified in other institutions.

Furthermore, voucher proponents can explain the paradigm we would abandon--the governmental (or "delegation") model. Again, people can understand that. We have delegated all sorts of functions to government--police, fire, sanitation, national defense, etc.--and also education. Voucher proponents therefore can explain their proposal quite simply as a proposal to "undelegate" education from the government and put it in the market place. The "paradigm shift" is from the governmental model to the market model.

The voucher concept has a number of advantages, and has attracted increasing attention in recent years. One of its greatest attractions is that seemingly it could avoid all the problems of reforming public education in one fell swoop. As people get increasingly frustrated with efforts to reform public schools, they see vouchers as an "end run" around all the bureaucratic obstructions, special interest groups, messy politics, etc. that have so beleaguered school reform.

A more directly educational advantage is seen in the way in which giving children, parents, and teachers more choice could help to overcome the passivity that so plagues public schools today and provide a greater sense of engagement and ownership in the educational enterprise. The voucher proposal thus includes important components that should be considered in formulating a new paradigm for public education.

The major problem with the voucher proposal as a candidate for the "banner around which to rally," however, is that, while the proposed paradigm shift is relatively clear, many people won't buy it. Some people who have become convinced that public education is so immune to reform that it might as well be abandoned are ready to rally around the voucher "banner." Thus far, however, most communities and policy-makers have sensed that this would not just be a reform or even restructuring of public education, but a whole new kind of system, based on fundamentally different values (hence the charges that it would "destroy public education"), and in most places where it has been proposed people are not ready to embrace a full shift to the market system as an alternative policy model.

Some of the resistance to vouchers can been explained in Kuhnian terms as the normal resistance to any change in basic paradigm, but the more the voucher debate has gone on, the more it appears that the resistance is not just because of failure to comprehend the proposal or bone-headed prejudice against the market system, but because of serious substantive questions about its desirability. Most fundamentally, the simplicity of the proposal, while advantageous for explaining the nature of the paradigm shift involved, may be a disadvantage in ultimately winning converts, since the market system paradigm does not seem to reflect the complex set of concepts and values American society holds regarding public education. In particular, it would make education a purely private affair (except for public funding of the voucher) while most Americans thus far have seemed to feel education should remain to some extent a community responsibility. [11]

A further problem with the voucher proposal is that while the pure model of a voucher system is relatively clear in paradigm terms, in realistic political terms it would be unlikely that the pure model could be enacted through our political system. The chances are that only a partial voucher system (paying only a portion of the costs of an education) would be enacted, making it useable only by more affluent families and undercutting its claim of promoting equal opportunity. Also it is questionable whether the political coalition necessary to pass the plan would favor the various protections proposed to prevent such problems as segregation, subsidizing of already privileged schools, etc. [12]

I won't dwell on the pros and cons of the voucher debate, since they have been covered extensively elsewhere. My point here is that although the pure voucher proposal represents a clear example of a significant paradigm shift, and although it includes important elements (namely the concept of choice which will be discussed below) which should be considered in formulating a new paradigm for public educaton, it has serious problems in becoming the "banner around which to rally."

Deschooling: From Schooling to Education

Another proposed paradigm shift that is comparable to the voucher proposal in its simplicity is the "deschooling" concept. The clearest expression of this approach in paradigm-like terms can be found in Seymour Sarason's Schooling in America (1983). Although he doesn't cite Kuhn, Sarason urges us to challenge one of the basic "axioms" underlying not only the present public school system, but all efforts to reform it--the axiom that "education best takes place in classrooms in school buildings." He sees this as an axiom which has been "embedded in a world view that is millennia old," and which, because it has "so rivited attention on the physically and socially isolated school building as to preclude recognition that the axiom was

both unfounded and self-defeating." He suggests that only when we can "be liberated from a world view in which is embedded a picture of where and how schooling 'should' take place," can we "begin to understand why efforts to improve schools are doomed." [13]

This axiom, thus, has functioned like a paradigm in science--as part of the world view taken for granted by educators and shaping both their actions in running schools and their thinking about how to reform them--and also blocking them from considering alternatives that might be conceived if one changed to a different world view without this axiom. [14]

Sarason's point is reminiscent of Ivan Illich, who's Deschooling Society was one of the educational policy sensations of the 1960's. Illich, like Sarason, had become convinced that schools were so hopelessly anti-educational that educators simply had to give up on this basic premise (or paradigm) of educational policy.

The big problem, of course, both with Illich and then twenty years later with Sarason, was that neither of them articulated a clear "new paradigm" to replace the one they felt was obsolete and unworkable. In paradigm terms they were proposing only half a paradigm shift: They urged giving up the existing paradigm but provided no alternative paradigm to switch to--no "banner around which to rally."

This does not mean that Illich and Sarason have not made important contributions to education policy, however. On the contrary, when a prevailing paradigm is not producing and can no longer produce the results needed, it is better to start questioning basic premises than to carry on as if fundamental questions need not be faced, even if the answers to these questions are not yet available. At least it gets people in to the process of working on the paradigm shift.

This, indeed, is exactly and consciously what Sarason saw himself doing. He states in the first chapter of Schooling in America that it is "not a call for action" and does not purport even to propose "the foundation for appropriate action" (i.e. a new paradigm). He explains that this is "not because I am opposed to action but because in this instance I would define action as appropriate only if those to be affected by it had worked through the turmoil associated with giving up an old stance and adopting a new one." The book, he said, "is an attempt to state and examine a particular axiom" which "requires serious challenge," not "a blueprint" for action. It is an effort to help policy-thinkers become "liberated from a world view in which is embedded a picture of where and how schooling 'should' take place," so they can begin the process of "'playing around' with ideas and problems" with the "hope that different people in different places will engage in a sketching process from which will emerge the foundation for appropriate action."

Without citing Kuhn, Sarason has given a pretty good description of the need for, and at least some of the process of, searching for a new paradigm. [15]

Illich, also, although not explaining himself so clearly, probably had his major influence not by proposing new policies and practices, but by helping people question basic premises they had taken for granted and causing them to begin "playing around" with new ideas from which new thinking could and did emerge. (This is how he influenced me, and I suspect many others who have concluded that not just reform but fundamental restructuring is needed.)

There are some signs of the effects of the "deschooling" thinking in the growth of the home-schooling movement and the increasing tolerance of state authorities to this type of "escape" from "the one best system"; and also in the growing recognition that education is not limited to schooling--that museums, libraries, families, the media, etc., are also important educational institutions and should be incorporated into any fully adequate and comprehensive conceptual framework for educational policy. Deschooling may become even more relevant with the further development of computers, videos, and other technology which can facilitate teaching and learning outside a school and classroom setting.

Nonetheless neither Illich or Sarason have come up with an alternative paradigm proposal that seems adequate or workable for dealing with the massive problems of providing education for millions of children. They were very helpful in pointing out the many anti-educational aspects of schools as we have known them, and even more helpful in pointing out how these problems are related to fundamental aspects of the structure of schooling that are not likely to be remedied by superficial reforms and projects. But they put their energies mostly into the negative half of the paradigm equation--what is wrong with the existing paradigm, and not the positive half--the search for an alternative "banner around which to rally."

This I believe is why interest in Illich began to wane and why so few people paid much attention to Sarason's Schooling in America despite his brilliant and provocative earlier work, The Culture of the School and the Problem of Change (1971). People have a hard enough time giving up old paradigms even when new ones are proposed; they have even less inclination to question familiar frameworks when no alternative is available. For those in charge of institutions (as opposed to scholars who can afford to abandon existing paradigms and "play around" with alternative conceptions), it is often unrealistic and possibly even irresponsible to abandon existing paradigms without new ones on which to base action and organize people's efforts.

Furthermore, neither Illich nor Sarason have made a totally convincing case that they have identified the correct element or

elements of the existing paradigm to discard or modify. Even if schools as we have known them are often highly anti-educational, this does not prove that they could not be otherwise. The "deschoolers" may turn out to be right in assuming that no transformation is possible to make them work, but their failure to look more carefully into the fundamental elements of the structure of schooling, and to consider the possibility that these might be modified to correct its problems, is one way of explaining the work now going on to find some kind of "restructuring" that would produce successful schools and a better "banner around which to rally" than "let's abolish schools."

Results: From Process to Outcomes

One of the most prominent recent efforts to propose a new paradigm "banner" for public education was the lead article in the April 1990 Phi Delta Kappan by Chester Finn, entitled "The Biggest Reform of All." Finn opens his article by saying that he "came late to Thomas Kuhn's famous book, The Structure of Scientific Revolutions, weary from innumerable articles on 'paradigm shifts' and wary of any single work so often invoked to explain so many disparate developments." But reading it, he says, proved to be a "rare, clarifying experience" and led him to see that educational policy is indeed confronted by a "paradigm shift" of "seismic" proportions, involving a "policy earthquake" and "definitional convulsion" of the most "profound" type. "History," he concludes, is going to view the final third of this century as a time when the very meaning of education was recast, at least in the United States and perhaps throughout the industrial world." [16]

How does Finn formulate this "seismic" paradigm shift? To quote the bare bones of the shift as Finn describes it: "Under the old conception (dare I say paradigm?), education was thought of as process and system, effort and intention, investment and hope." "Under the new definition, now struggling to be born, education is the result achieved, the learning that takes root when the process has been effective." [17]

Finn is on to something of crucial importance in seeing the need for the new paradigm to focus on results. There is indeed something about the currently prevailing public education paradigm in the United States that promotes "goal displacement," i.e. a tendency, just as Finn and I and others have suggested, to focus on process instead of results: So long as the rules and lesson plans, etc., are followed, the system (as well as many parents, students and citizens) considers the job done even if learning results are abysmal. In this sense, the old (but still prevailing) paradigm does seem to "define" education as a process. (I call this the "service delivery" mindset, to be discussed further below.)

If, as Finn forcefully points out, we shift to a "results" definition of education, there would be more tendency to be dissatisfied with poor results--a shift I assume most people (at least these days) would agree is to the good, however painful it may be for those in charge of or engaged in the processes that therefore would be challenged and have to change in order to produce better results.

Finn's formulation thus follows the first two key steps of the format set out above for clarifying a paradigm shift: (1) It defines both the old and the new paradigms, and (2) it makes a strong case for at least one of the advantages of the new paradigm over the old one. He does not address as directly the third step--explaining how to win people over to the new paradigm or how to implement it--but that's not the purpose of the article. He is writing more as an historian, explaining what is happening, rather than as a policy advocate, urging what should happen (although, as is often the case with ostensibly objective analysis of "what is," it is clear where his sympathies lie).

Finn also provides an excellent exposition of how Kuhn's analysis can help us understand why the needed paradigm shift in education is so difficult, and this is very useful in helping people see why real restructuring requires different strategies, time-frames, training, etc. than more typical reforms.

Important as the main thrust of Finn's article is, however, (as will be explained further below), there are problems with its formulation of the paradigm shift. For starters, can it really be said that people operating under the old paradigm don't define education as results as well as process? Finn himself admits that the definition of "education" in his dictionary, which presumably reflects common usage (i.e. common mindsets or paradigms) "offers as coequal first meanings both 'the action or process of educating' and 'the knowledge and development resulting from an education process.'" [18]

What if, after a year or two of a new Superintendent in Scarsdale, none of the seniors get into "good" colleges? Are we to assume that the public (or the staff) would be satisfied because all the schools were operating according to the policies and rules prescribed by the new superintendent? Or even in an inner city, if all of the students come out illiterate and delinquent, could we assume that people would be satisfied so long as the prescribed process was followed? And would this not have been true from the earliest days of public education? To suggest that the old paradigm does not in some important way define educaton as results is to assume that it is totally irrational, which is always a dangerous assumption. (Even the flat earth paradigm, bizarre as it may appear today, was quite rational for its day, and in fact is still used by most of us for short distance travel.)

And what of the "new" paradigm? Can it really be a paradigm which defines education only as "results" and includes no concept of

process? Doesn't any adequate conceptual framework (paradigm) for educational policy have to include concepts for both process and results (just as Finn's dictionary suggests)? Since an educational policy paradigm is the matrix of assumptions, concepts, formulas, etc. on the basis of which one organizes and conducts the educational enterprise, to say that one's definition of education is simply "results achieved" is seriously incomplete.

Even with regard to the "results" portion of the needed paradigm, defining education as "results achieved" tells us nothing about what kind of results are called for. What if the "results" most people are satisfied with are mediocre education for most children and abysmal education for a large percentage (especially if they are poor and minority)? Then "defining" education as "results achieved" won't solve (or even address) this problem. Indeed this is not a bad description of what has been happening during these 40 years of "reform": Not enough people have been dissatisfied with the current results, so they have been willing to live with things as they are or with relatively superficial (and ineffective) reforms.

The recent shift to considering "restructuring" instead of "reform" can be seen as an awakening to the realization that the old results we have been achieving in American education are not adequate for today's world, and that the present policy framework is not going to get us the results we now need. This leads me to conclude that the paradigm shift we need (and are perhaps in the midst of) is not just a shift in defining education as "results" instead of "process," but includes a shift in the kinds and levels of results we want.

Finn as much as admits this when he says that the changes in our assumptions when we define education as results instead of process, "seismic" though they are, "would not themselves have had much impact on everyday educational practice had not something of great consequence been happening more or less concurrently in the 'real world'": namely, "the widening awareness of and intensifying concern about the lackluster quality of American education." [19]

An adequate paradigm shift analysis in educational policy must explain how each of the competing paradigms defines (or conceptualizes) both process and results, and must make a case for why the proposed set of definitions is superior to the prevailing ("old") set. The problem Finn rightly points to comes in my view not from the old (still prevailing) paradigm "defining" education as "process," but from its conceptualizing educational process and organization in a way (the bureaucratic "service delivery" definition of educational process) that tends to make the process an end itself—a substitute for academic learning and other educational results. A satisfactory new paradigm has to solve this problem by coming up with a better conception of educational process that will avoid this serious flaw in the current paradigm, not by eliminating any concept of educational process, as Finn's formulation suggests.

Finn, elegant writer that he is, tries to take care of this problem through charming, homey metaphors: He admits that "the old paradigm had not scorned cognitive learning [i.e. results] so much as taken it for granted." His analysis is that the old paradigm asssumed that desired outcomes were "firmly harnessed to education"—and, indeed, that there was "so direct and automatic a causal relationship between inputs and outcomes that altering the former was believed ineluctably to change the latter. System changes and student results were seen as opposite ends of a single oar, rigidly linked and mounted in such a way that, if you tugged at one end, the other end would move through the water."

Finn sees this as a faulty premise, and claims instead that system changes and student results are "not firmly joined at all," but are "more like two separate oars, capable of moving independently." He elaborates the paradigm shift confronting us in education, then, to include not just a change in the definition of education from process to results, but a shift away from the "rigid oar"--from the assumed causal relationship between inputs and outputs. [20]

But this doesn't solve the problem; it makes it worse. If we are to shift away from the "rigid oar," what are we to shift to? "Rigid" is politically incorrect these days, so no one would want to admit to being in favor of a rigid anything. But doesn't any conceptual framework (paradigm) for educational policy assume a causal relationship between inputs and outputs, between "system changes" and "student results," between "process" and "results achieved"? To propose a new policy framework, but then say, "If you use this framework, don't expect any results," would be ridiculous. Indeed a prime criterion for an improved social policy paradigm—if not the prime criterion—is that it will produce better results. If there is no causal connection between the proposed new paradigm and better results, why propose it? Why would anyone rally around a banner which won't produce better results? [21]

Finn is certainly right that not all system changes or inputs will produce desired results, but surely no old-paradigmist, or anyone else, would claim otherwise. The problem has been not in assuming a "direct and automatic . . causal relationship between inputs and outcomes," but rather in assuming either (1) that current inputs (processes) are the best available and will produce as good results as are attainable, and that therefore, if more results are desired, then more of these same inputs should be applied; or (2) if "reform" of the existing inputs is needed, reforms within the existing educational process paradigm will be sufficient: Changes in the process paradigm have not been thought necessary—or perhaps, more accurately, have mostly not been thought of at all, since people usually take the current process paradigm for granted and don't consider alternatives.

It is this unwillingness or inability to see beyond the present public school paradigm, not a generalized belief that altering inputs will "ineluctably" change outcomes, that has led so much of the reform effort of the past forty years to resemble pulling harder on an "oar" that doesn't produce the results needed. And this is also what has led some of us to conclude that we need a new educational process paradigm, because the old one isn't, and can't, get us the results we need. Finn's "oar" metaphor seems to suggest that we needn't look for a new paradigm to help us develop educational processes that will produce the results we need; we need instead only to cast aside the assumption that process can produce results (the "rigid oar") and define education as unspecified "results."

Finn also leads us off the trail by suggesting the lack of relationship between inputs and outputs (the concept that they are "more like two separate oars") was demonstrated by the famous 1966 U.S. Office of Education report on Equality of Educational Opportunity (conducted by James Coleman and a team of social scientists), which Finn calls "perhaps the single greatest source of the tectonic movements that have generated today's earthquake. But all that Coleman, et al, demonstrated in the EEO study was that the current school processes or "inputs" (or more accurately, the inputs his team measured, such as age of buildings and formal teacher credentials, which are far from the most important school processes for producing results) did not produce the desired outcomes. He did not demonstrate at all that inputs in general don't produce outputs, or specifically that some other inputs than those he measured might not produce desired results. And he certainly didn't demonstrate that in looking for a new and better paradigm or policy framework for educational policy we should not look for one which could help us design "system changes" (process) that could produce better results. [22]

Finn also leads us astray in suggesting that the 1966 EEO study was a major factor in shifting our paradigm from inputs to outputs—from process to educational achievement. As a government official who had some responsibility for the EEO study at the time, I would like to think this was the case, but in fact the primary result of Coleman's study was not to shift the focus of policy from school processes to educational results but to shift the blame for poor results from schools to students and their families. For twenty years after the EEO study school officials cited it as proof that it is not schools that are responsible for student failure but "home factors" (e.g. lazy, irresponsible parents), and in fact many people still cite the Coleman study to justify this "blame-the-victim" mindset even today. In my view, the EEO study, rather than being a major factor in helping us shift to a focus on results, was unintentionally a major factor blocking and delaying this necessary shift, because so many people interpreted it as proof, as Finn's formulation also seems to suggest, that school processes can't have any effect on children's learning.

The shift to a focus on results has come more from a reaction against the Coleman study than from the study itself. Slowly (all too slowly in my view) people began to realize that the "blame-the-victim" formula reinforced by the Coleman report, comforting as it was for those who didn't want to change or rethink educational policy, was an unproductive dead end. Of course, home factors are related to school achievement. Surely people, including staunch believers in the old paradigm, knew that before the Coleman report. But so what? If the results are inadequate (which we're finally beginning to conclude as part of the paradigm shift regarding what results are needed, not from the Coleman report), then we had better find educational processes that will produce the needed results, taking into account the realities of home factors. The failure of the old paradigm to deal adequately with home factors is what has led some of us to conclude that we need a new conceptualization of the educational process--a matter to be discussed more fully below under "Partnership: From Bureaucracy to Collaboration." [23]

Another way to look at this problem with Finn's formulation is to realize that defenders of the present system can say that they also define education as "results," and that they are doing all they can to achieve the results desired, but that many students aren't "motivated" and their parents "don't care"; therefore "don't blame us." This in fact has been an important component of the mindset of school officials that has enabled them to hang on to the existing paradigm in the face of the increasing pressures for improved results. Defining education as "results" doesn't "solve this problem," and is therefore an inadequate paradigm; it can still leave schools fundamentally unchanged and school officials and the public blaming the kids and their families for the failure.

Finn's metaphor is beautiful for summoning up the image of school officials (and school reformers) "tugging" ever more frantically at an oar that fails to move us forward. It reminds me of Alvin Tofler's description of the "classic response to a need for fundamental change--the initial tendency is to work the old system harder." But the proper suggestion from the metaphor should be that we need a new paradigm that will produce the results we want when we "pull on it," i.e. when we use this matrix of assumptions and concepts to define the results we need and to design the educational processes needed to achieve them. Finn's definition of the new paradigm and the paradigm shift involved, important as it is for calling attention to the "results" aspect of the new paradigm, is inadequate for this purpose.

Indeed, it begins to look more and more like there isn't any simple, single concept or definition which if "shifted" will provide us with the conceptual framework (paradigm) we need. It may be that we have to look for a more complex paradigm formulation--and certainly one which includes a concept of educational organization and process which will be able to produce the results needed for today's world.

Partnership: From Bureaucracy to Collaboration

When I wrote Education Through Partnership at the end of the 1970's I had not heard of Thomas Kuhn or "paradigm shifts." When several readers told me that what they liked about the book was that it proposed a "paradigm shift," I had no idea what they were talking about. The phrase was as mystifying to me as it still is to many people today who hear it for the first time without knowing Kuhn's thesis. I didn't get around to reading The Structure of Scientific Revolutions until the mid-1980's, but when I did I had a reaction similar to Finn's "clarifying experience."

Reading Kuhn made me realize that I had indeed, as my readers had said, without knowing it proposed a paradigm shift—in almost classic Kuhnian terms. Part I of Education Through Partnership was an exposition of the basic flaws in the current paradigm underlying public education. It explained how the present system is failing, not because it is "a little rusty" and needs "a can of oil and a few new parts," but because it is "the wrong kind of system," based on faulty fundamental premises of governmentalization (delegation to government), bureaucratization (specialization, dehumanized roles, top-down, chain-of-command authority and accountability), and pseudo-professionalization (teachers as pseudo-scientific, bureaucratic technicians, not leaders of an educational process and helpers of children). [24]

My analysis was that these basic premises, although adopted for what seemed like valid reasons in their day and now taken for granted, tend to produce a "culture of bureaucracy" and a "service delivery mentality," when education instead should be seen as "a dimension of human development dependent on personal motivation, initiative, and relationships"--to define education as something "delegated" to government when it must be a "shared responsibility" of home, school, and community--and to define teachers as the workers whose efficiency must be increased, when "teachers are not the prime workers in the educational process; the students are," since "they produce learning by their own efforts, not by having it 'delivered' to them." I concluded

> "that the prevailing conceptual framework of public education in the United States is fundamentally faulty and that this faulty conception is at the heart of the policy problems confronting education today.
>
> Education has been conceived as a governmental service-delivery system: we have set up government-run, professionally staffed bureaus to 'deliver' education to our children. When the results are unsatisfactory, our service-delivery approach prompts us to try to solve the problem by delivering more services or by making the service delivery machinery either more efficient, through improved technology,

or more accountable, through political action or better management.

> Attempts to reduce to a delivery system something that is by its nature not a service and not deliverable will not work. The effort withers the energy and commitment and obstructs the productive relationships of the key participants in the educational enterprise—students, teachers, parents, and citizens. To continue with the service delivery approach can only perpetuate what John Holt calls 'a failure and a disaster.'" [25]

In paradigm-shift terms, I had concluded that there was a a paradigm "crisis": "The concept of public education as a professionalized, bureaucratized, governmental service-delivery system is doomed beyond recall. Its legitimacy is at an end. It will take a while for this fact to be fully recognized, but its impact is already being felt and will increasingly bring pressure for fundamental change." "The nation must look at the structure of the system to discover how it turns even good intentions into bad results." The only hope for American public education, as I saw it, was the development of "an alternative policy framework," leading to the "reconstruction of educational policy" and a "rebuilt educational system." [26]

A paradigm crisis is different from an educational or social crisis, talk of which began to fill the media in the early '80's ("nation at risk," "rising tide of mediocrity," rampant illiteracy, plummeting scores, drop-outs, drugs, crime, etc.). A paradigm crisis in the social policy area is a crisis in the conceptual framework underpinning the social policy or institution—in our case public school policy and the public school system--a conclusion that because of its underlying premises the system not only is not working but can not work to solve our problems. Hence the need for new underlying premises, i.e. a new paradigm.

This kind of conclusion, if we follow the Kuhn analogy, cannot be "proved." It cannot be logically deduced from the normal social policy process of fitting means to ends and testing out alternative policies and programs within the existing policy paradigm to see if they "work" (the equivalent of conducting "normal science" in the science community). It comes from experiencing and thinking about the many efforts and failures of trying to work things out within the existing conceptual framework and concluding that "this isn't going to work; there must be something fundamentally wrong not just with the programs and policies, but with underlying policy framework."

Up to this point I was following the classic Kuhnian process for a paradigm shift—deciding that the current paradigm is no longer workable. But I could not find a fully satisfactory "new paradigm" to replace it—something analogous to the sun-centered solar system

model—"a banner around which to rally"—something at least as fundamental and yet simple as the concepts of bureaucracy, delegation to government, and techno-"professionalism" that dominate the present public school system—but better, more suited to the educational process and capable of avoiding the pitfalls of those concepts.

In searching for an alternative paradigm I got no answer from reviewing the reform proposals of the day; all I found were proposed programs and policies within the existing policy framework (more of everything we were doing, better managed, better trained, etc.), not an alternative policy framework that would correct the flawed underlying premises of the existing system.

In the absence of a fully satisfactory new paradigm to propose, Education Through Partnership did two things: First it made an urgent plea that finding a workable alternative conceptual model "is the most important question facing education in the United States today. The search for new approaches has begun and must not be abandoned until a new consensus is achieved, one that is appropriate to American social and political values and capable of producing the education wanted by individuals and society." [27] Although I didn't know it in Kuhnian terms, I was saying that American Education must find a new paradigm.

Second, I proposed "a framework to assist in the reconception of American Education." The framework I suggested was derived from a conceptual model developed by political economist Albert O, Hirschman in his essay Exit, Voice and Loyalty. This essay, had gained attention in other fields because it seemed to explain much about human behavior in institutions, social groups, and economic systems. I found that with some adjustment in Hirschman's thesis (changing "exit" to "choice" to allow for positive as well as negative choices, and including "school staff as well as students and parents" in the human dynamics of how voice, choice, and loyalty might work), it could help us conceptualize the different kinds of relationships from those engendered by the delegation/bureaucratic/service delivery model that were needed to produce the sense of ownership and commitment required for successful education. [28]

Hirschman also postulated a dynamic relationship between "exit" ("choice" in my reformulation) and "voice" that I felt could help us solve some of the policy puzzles that seemed unresolvable within our present policy framework—particularly the conflicts and contradictions between choice and the democratic values of public education (voice), both of which seemed to have merit but which could not be reconciled within traditional public education ideology.

Part II of Education Through Partnership therefore set out "Voice, Choice, and Loyalty" as foundation principles for a new policy framework for public education. "Within the proposed framework, the concept of service delivery is replaced by the concept of partnership—partnership between learners and teachers, homes and

schools, and communities and school systems. Government, bureaucracy, and professionalization [defined as techno-bureaucratic pseudo-professionalism] are deemphasized to give greater attention to the voice, choice, and loyalty of the educational partners." [29]

Part III of the book then attempted to apply this new framework to see if it could help us deal better with some of the "dilemmas, paradoxes, and contradictions" currently facing educational policy (i.e. do a better job of solving "puzzles" in Kuhnian terms): equal educational opportunity, community control, family choice, family alienation, accountability, minimum competency testing, teacher professionalism, school-based management, alternative schools, cooperative learning, small size, racial integration, bilingual education, etc. [30]

The proposed framework didn't work perfectly, but it seemed to me to "solve puzzles" and suggest viable policy options much better than the current policy framework, and many people found it helpful in explaining why we have been failing in our reform efforts and how we might approach a solution. Nevertheless, it was not consciously designed as a "paradigm shift," and we must ask how well it can serve for this purpose. Much of it still seems to me to work pretty well, and in fact seems to be consistent with conclusions many other people are reaching as they confront the failure of school reforms and begin to look for more fundamental restructuring. But it doesn't fully meet the need for "a banner around which to rally."

With regard to the conclusion that we are in a paradigm crisis, many policy analysts are reaching this same conclusion, although from different perspectives and sometimes with different formulations. Sarason (1983), as we have seen, drew on his many years of effort and frustrations in school reform to conclude that we must question our basic premise that education requires schools and classrooms. Finn, in the article discussed above, has concluded that our basic definition of education as process is faulty. Chubb and Moe (1990), in making their case for shifting to the market paradigm, have pointed to fundamental flaws in the governmental/bureaucratic model almost identical to those discussed in Education Through Partnership, and although their statistical methodology and proposed solution have been questioned, no one has refuted their conclusion about unworkability of the current basic policy and organizational framework of public education.

Meanwhile a much more powerful ideational trend has taken hold in the 1980's that has reinforced the "paradigm crisis" in educational policy: the modern manangement movement based on a revolution (paradigm shift) in organization theory. This is a much bigger story than can be told here, but it can be summarized as the realization in management theory that even factories can't be run on the factory model anymore—at least if they want excellence and high productivity. The popularity of such works as Peters and Waterman's In Search of

Excellence, Rosabeth Kanter's The Change Masters, and the rediscovery of the ideas of W. Edwards Deming signal a radical loss of faith in the rational-bureaucratic model as the best way to organize human beings if you want high motivation, initiative, and flexibility in meeting complex challenges. [31]

Since public school systems were indeed modeled on the rational-bureaucratic "factory model," this trend in organizational theory has contributed greatly to the loss of faith in the basic organizational and policy framework for public education. After all, if even factory workers, with business' hard-nosed "bottom-line" of profit and ability to specify goals and operations, can't be expected to work at their highest potential under the old paradigm, isn't it even more likely that this is not the best organizational climate for teachers and students? As a result, education organization theorists have swung strongly toward the conclusion that we need to find new conceptualizations for educational organization and policy (i.e. new paradigms).

I do not mean to suggest that the numbers of people who think seriously about the need for a new policy framework (paradigm), as opposed to those who just adopt the new terminology while still using the old paradigm as their operating road-map, are anything more than still a small, perhaps tiny, minority of all the literally millions of "decision-makers" who, through their decisions and actions, shape the reality of public education (if we include, as we should, not only official policy-makers, but teachers, administrators, parents, students, etc.). But the number is increasing. And, furthermore, many more educators and policy-makers, even without elaborate analytical or statistical demonstration of the bankruptcy of the present paradigm, or citing Kuhn or modern management theory, are becoming convinced that there is something fundamentally wrong with the underlying bureaucratic/service delivery structure of the American public school system. In Hechinger's terms, there is beginning to be enough "dissatisfaction with things as the are" to provide the climate for a "revolution."

This, I think, is the major explanation for the tremendous upswing in calls for "restructuring" from all sorts of people who have never heard of "paradigm shifts." After a while, what at first seemed radical and destructive comes to be seen as common sense and necessary. What is needed for such people to begin to think more clearly in paradigm terms is clarification of how this kind of shift in underlying concepts is a necessary aspect of restructuring if it is to be successful, and a credible formulation of a new workable conceptual framework (paradigm) to replace the one increasingly being seen as obsolete.

The question of how to conceptualize and articulate the new paradigm, therefore, is still a paramount need. How well do the concepts of voice, choice, and loyalty hold up as components of a new

paradigm? As individual concepts, they are more salient now than ten years ago: Choice has become much more popular, either in its free market form, with a new boost from the Chubb and Moe book, or as a component of public school reform. Voice is getting much more attention in the teacher and parent empowerment movements. And loyalty is an important element of the trend toward "ownership" and the small, alternative and mini school movements. Voice and loyalty are also strong components of the new management movement, as can be seen in concepts such as quality circles, teaming, the importance of values, symbols, myths and shared purpose to organizational effectiveness.

But because voice, choice and loyalty--and especially voice and choice--are usually seen as separate and unrelated concepts, they are providing the basis for separate and often competing "banners around which to rally": e.g. "Choice," "Teacher Professionalism," "Parent Involvement," "Student Rights," etc. In my view the adapted-Hirschman formula, which integrates voice, choice and loyalty into a single policy framework, and shows their relationship to each other, is a superior conceptualization than each of the three as separate concepts, both because it is truer to the way human beings and institutions need to work (as Hirschman's thesis suggests), and because, politically, a unifying paradigm, rather than a number of competing, partially valid but incomplete and conflicting ones, provides the basis for a more successful reform movement.

One example of the use of a unified approach can be found in the "C.U.R.E." plan proposed by a citywide coalition in Chicago in 1988 in connection with that city's recent restructuring. It recommended the combination of "voice and choice" as the "real reform" needed for Chicago's schools. Whether this integration of concepts that are often the banners of rival political forces helped develop the political unity that passed the Chicago reform bill may not be able to be determined, but it's worth thinking about as an example for other reform efforts at the local, state, and national levels. Donald Moore's chapter on "Voice and Choice in Chicago" in Choice and Control in American Education, Vol.2 points out that choice can undermine the democratic elements (i.e. voice) of the new Chicago reform if it isn't carefully handled. [32]

Another example of joining choice and voice is found in Deborah Meier's article, "Choice Can Save Public Education," in which she says that liberals should embrace choice, but include it within a broader public education policy framework that includes democratic process (i.e. voice) both in the community and in the school. Her own Central Part East Schools in New York's Community School District 4 (East Harlem) are a beautiful example of the integration of the principles of choice and voice, i.e. it is a "new paradigm" school. [33]

Modern management theory is increasingly showing the relationship between voice, loyalty and high productivity: People who have a say

in what they're doing are much more likely to have a sense of "ownership" and to hold themselves accountable (and hold each other accountable at the work site) for carrying it out. This is seen as a more effective type of accountability than the old-paradigm top-down command and control concept. As school administrators become increasingly exposed to these ideas, concepts such as shared decision-making, school-based management, teamwork, collaborative learning, etc. are beginning to make more sense and gain more acceptance. [34]

Furthermore a number of school systems, states, and even the federal government seem to be combining all these concepts in an ad hoc, pragmatic fashion through the political process, e.g. by just adding them together in their omnibus educational reform agendas in order to meet the demands of various constituencies, even if they are not explained or justified in terms of an integrated policy framework. The fact that these sometimes-assumed-to-be-conflicting policies seem to be surviving along side each other in politically sponsored reform agendas may be an indication that a more comprehensive conceptualization is crystalizing in people's minds even if it hasn't been fully rationalized or articulated. [35]

Nevertheless, while the concepts of voice, choice and loyalty have been gaining ground, there is no agreement yet on verbal formulas or a symbol system to express a new paradigm that includes them. "Voice, Choice, and Loyalty," is not likely to serve very well as "a banner around which to rally." It is too abstract and awkward, and despite its possibly successful use in Chicago, it may elicit overly negative responses from those who do not know the definitions of the terms or who are so vehemently opposed to one or another of the elements (especially choice and loyalty) that the mere sight of the wrong word is enough to prevent any constructive thinking or positive response.

The modern management movement is beginning to provide terminology that helps signal the new thinking: "organizational climate," "close to the customer," "productivity through people," etc. But these also are abstract, and while they point to an an alternative to the bureaucratic approach, they don't quite identify basic conceptual premises and models that can compete with Weber's rational bureaucratic model, or Copernicus's sun-centered solar system, for conceptual coherence and accessibility. Furthermore, since they have been developed primarily in the context of business corporations, many educators feel they don't "fit" the realities of schools and the educational process.

In my own view, with some translation, much of the modern management movement works well in helping to conceptualize the new paradigm needed for public education, and is very consistent with what the voice, choice and loyalty formula was trying to get at. For instance, once the students are conceptualized as the prime "workers," as proposed in Education Through Partnership, then much of what this movement has to say about developing motivation, commitment, sense of

ownership, self-management, etc., applies very well to education. Nevertheless, most educators, parents and students have not yet adopted this matrix of values and concepts.

"Partnership," which I chose reluctantly for the title of my book because of its amorphous meaning, has turned out to be a very successful "banner," with a tremendous upswing in its usage in recent years, but it has had just the problem I worried about: It does not signal a fundamental reconceptualization of public education. Every educator in the country, including the staunchest adherents of the old paradigm, can and will say their school or school system is a wonderful "partnership," even though the reality may be that teachers live in fear, students are unmotivated, and parents never get beyond the bake-sale.

Furthermore, the term has been somewhat pre-empted by the "school-business" partnership movement, and while there are some excellent programs within this movement, many school-business "partnerships" have little to do with changing the relationships of students, teachers and parents, or the underlying policy framework of public education. In fact, very few of the now legions of people who espouse "partnership" or "partnerships" have in mind what I meant in Education Through Partnership.

"Partnership" also has another serious flaw: It doesn't answer the question, "Partnership for what?" All sorts of "partnership" efforts have begun, usually with good intentions and sometimes with real success in developing friendly relationships among the participants, but too often the effort has no clear goal. At best the goal, stated or implied, usually is to "improve" something or other--discipline, the math curriculum, reading scores, attendance, etc. But, with such indefinite goals, any kind of "improvement" is seen as success, whether or not it really does much to increase the educational success of children.

Although Education Through Partnership based its analysis of the failure of the present paradigm on "measuring present achievement against the educational needs of children who will spend most of their lives in the complex and changing world of the twenty-first century," neither the term "partnership" nor the concepts of voice, choice, and loyalty, nor the terminology of the modern management movement, make clear enough that a change in goals is an important part of the paradigm shift that is now needed in education. [36]

Here is where we have to come back to the issue that Finn raised in suggesting the shift to a "results" paradigm, even though his formulation has the problems outlined above. The analysis in Education Through Partnership tried to deal with this issue by pointing out that, because the prevailing paradigm defines the process of education as "delivering educational services," then, as long as the prescribed services have been delivered, "the failure of large numbers of

children to learn can be, and has been, explained by the presumed lack of potential of the children." It also pointed out that because of the service delivery mindset, "there have been no established educational achievement standards against which to measure [children's] achievement." [37]

I proposed that the establishment of such achievement standards, because they "are output standards rather than input standards," could reduce the bureaucratic nature of the system by providing "a basis for urging states to permit local school districts and individual schools to deviate from present state requirements, as long as they produce the desired results." An emphasis on results, therefore, and even prescribed achievement levels that are expected of everyone, could be a part of the new paradigm and could be integrated with its concept that "the individual school, rather than the system, is the key unit in developing productive learning relationships," because the school is the "social organism with internal values and loyalties that make the difference between success and failure." [38]

But still, even with these explanations in the book, neither the "voice, choice and loyalty" nor the "partnership" formulation of the new paradigm made clear enough that a fundamental change in thinking about goals has to be part of the paradigm shift. Looking back on it, I simply assumed and stated what I thought would be obvious--that we must close the large gap between what children are achieving and what they need, both academically and in character development. This is in fact what brought me into educational policy in the first place in the 1950's and what drove me finally to conclude in the 1970's that reform within the present policy framework would never be able to close such a large gap. But I did not, in Education through Partnership, articulate sufficiently that our present low expectations were an integral part of the "matrix" of assumptions and premises (the paradigm) of public education, and of the mindsets of its participants (students, parents, school boards and legislators, as well as school staff), and that a shift to higher goals had to be part of the needed paradigm shift.

We end our review of four proposed paradigm shifts for public education with a conclusion that none of them quite meets the need for a "banner around which to rally"--for a verbal formulation of a new policy framework for public education which has a chance of wide acceptance, which fits the needs of education today, which can provide the basis for successful schools for the future, and which can solve the problems which have remained unsolvable within the present policy framework. We have found, however, many elements of a possible new paradigm which seem to make sense and which have a chance of winning sufficient converts (indeed are already doing so) to produce the new paradigm we need. The question is whether they can be synthesized into a coherent whole that can provide the basis for a new policy framework for public education.

III. FINDING A BANNER AROUND WHICH TO RALLY

It is normal for paradigm shifts to involve conceptual confusion while the shift is underway, especially in their early stages when many people still don't feel the need for a shift, and when those who do have not yet agreed upon what shift is needed or how to articulate it.

The lack of an agreed upon formulation of the shift now needed in public education therefore should not discourage us unduly: Paradigm shifts take time and are difficult, especially in a social institution as complex and extensive as the American public school system. As Finn points out, "a deeply ingrained belief structure is involved, complete with all the convictions, assumptions, and presumed causal links that practitioners have held dear since their own students days. In this they are joined by more than a few policy makers and a goodly portion of the general public." All sorts of present policies and procedures, institutional folkways, professional relationships, habitual verbal formulas, parent and student attitudes, etc., help explain "the persistence of the spell the old paradigm continues to cast" over the educational community and the public. [39]

Furthermore, up to now the educational policy community has not really been trying very hard to find a new paradigm. For most of the 1980's, despite the unprecedented fever of educational reform (or perhaps because of it), hardly anyone was even looking for an alternative policy framework (or new paradigm). They were busy--busier than ever before in American history--trying to reform and improve schools within the existing paradigm--trying to "work the old system harder"--tugging frantically at the "oar" already in the oarlock--rather than trying to find or create a new conceptual framework for public education on which a more successful system could be built.

The 1980's may have been the last gasp of trying to "work the old system harder." One hopes so, so we can get on with what is now a more urgent priority than ever--finding a new paradigm and building a new kind of system. This is in fact what is now under way in the "restructuring" movement. But it still lacks an agreed-upon conceptual framework for the new "structure," and there is still vast misunderstanding about the need for such a new framework.

Since public education, particularly in America, has so many people and interest groups who will have a say in what will happen, and no single authority which can lay down a blueprint and order it built (and no blueprint yet available even if there were such an authority), there will need to be some degree of consensus about at least the basic concepts of what is being built, otherwise the degree of chaos and confusion, working at cross purposes, and mis-shapen new structures, will cause too many of the restructuring

efforts to fail. This, in turn will cause people to lose faith in the enterprise, and perhaps in public education (and democratic society?) altogether.

How can we find a "banner around which to rally"? One way is to continue the process undertaken in a sketchy way in this essay: Continue to examine, critique and debate about all proposed new paradigm formulations—and invent new ones to examine if necessary—and see if "the market place of ideas" can produce the consensus needed. This will require us to do the intellectual and conceptual work that too often has been brushed aside as "impractical" or too diverting from the "urgent need to improve schools." This kind of work would follow the classic Kuhnian model of what happens in the scientific community when work has to be done to develop, refine, and implement a new scientific paradigm.

Another approach, which can complement this conceptualizing and dialoguing process, is based on the fact that a good deal of discussion about, and even implementation of, restructuring is already underway, and we can look to see if any consensus is beginning to emerge around the implicit or explicit concepts that people seem to have in mind as they try to figure out what makes sense and what will work in "restructuring" schools. This is in effect the method that Finn used in his article: He noticed trends in people's language and behavior which he felt signaled the beginnings of a "seismic" shift in outlook. This method has validity, even though Finn's formulation of what he found has the problems pointed out above.

There is no guarantee that a growing consensus is necessarily on the right track, but since two of the characteristics of a successful paradigm are its ability to gain adherents and its ability to "work" as it is put into practice, a growing consensus around certain concepts might be an indication of the new paradigm we need.

I believe there is a growing consensus of this nature around two basic ideas: collaboration (as opposed to bureaucratic relationships) and success for all (as opposed to "winners and losers"):

Collaboration

"Collaboration," according to Susan Ohanian (who has written a lampoon of the trend in education's newspaper of record, Education Week), has become a "badge of right-minded professionalism." We are witnessing," she laments, a "rapid rise in the 'collaboration' curve, going from 2.8 mentions per 10,000 words in education journals in 1982 to 1,345 in 1989." Ms. Ohanian is alarmed by the trend, seeing a "danger of being pedagogically mugged" by the proponents of "working in teams" etc. "Zealotry runs high," she complains: "Disagree with a collaborationist and more than likely you'll find yourself trying to prove you aren't a fascist." [40]

Ms. Ohanian is one of our most talented educational writers, and I have no quarrel with her complaints about some of the sillier manifestations of the "collaboration" trend. But if we take seriously her calculation that mention of the word in education journals has increased almost 5000% in seven years, something's going on out there besides silliness.

"Collaboration," like "restructuring," is a protean term which can mean many different things. Since literally it means "working together," it could be applied even to the most uncreative, unmotivated, and overbureaucratized school of teachers and administrators "working together" in the same building. But what seems to be intended in its vastly increased usage in educational discourse in recent years is just the opposite: It is used to connote a very different kind of relationship from bureaucratic assignment of duties and supervision by higher-ups to make sure they are carried out. It connotes teamwork, mutual problem-solving, shared responsibility, self-motivated working together of semi-autonomous partners, and flexibility in figuring out a child's needs and interacting to meet them. It includes not only very different relationships among teachers and between teachers and administrators, but also different relationships with and among students, parents and community. It is more basic even than voice or choice, since they are merely the means for producing the collaborative efforts and spirit needed for successful education.

The collaboration concept as it is emerging in the reality of schools undergoing "restructuring," does not call for the abolition of all bureaucracy or hierarchy. Practicality dictates that many functions and decisions can better be carried out using elements of the existing "structure"--especially for those functions related to administration or accountability for funds which have less to do with the heart of the teaching and learning process. But when it comes to the magical relationships between teachers and students that bring excellence to education, and to the roles of teachers as professional leaders of this process, those involved in restructuring are finding that bureaucracy has to be subordinated to other values and mindsets.

The term "partnership," which I used to connote this alternative approach in Education Through Partnership has also seen a great increase in usage in recent years, as have its corollary concepts, parent involvement, cooperative learning, peer tutoring, community involvement, collaboration with other agencies, etc. While "partnership" has problems as a "banner," as pointed out above, the concepts intended by more and more people who are using either "partnership" or "collaboration," (i.e. as a basically different kind of relationship from the current paradigm) are the concepts of the new paradigm that have to be brought into the open and articulated so that people can decide whether they indeed hold promise of providing a better framework for educational policy and practice.

Success for All

"Success for all children"—or some variation of this phrase—or sometimes just the word "all" or "every" inserted in front of "children" or "students"—are also phrases that are seen and heard much more often today than they were a few years ago. (E.g. Robert Slavin's "Success for All" school model in Baltimore; Henry Levin's Accelerated School model which promotes bringing all children to sixth grade level by sixth grade; Goodlad's "lament" over the "'Technocratic' Emphasis in Teaching" because it deemphasizes the "moral responsibility of teachers to that little word 'all'" in regard to children [41]; the Committee for Economic Development's goal "to provide all of our children with the opportunity to learn, to grow, and to become informed and productive adults" [42]; San Diego's Schools of the Future Commission concluding that "the economic vitality of the city depended on the school system's ability to serve all of its students well, not just those who are white and middle class," [43]; the Presidential Education Summit's call for school restructuring to produce "a rigorous program of instruction designed to ensure that every child can acquire the knowledge and skills required in an economy in which our citizens must be able to think for a living" [44], are just a few of the myriad examples.)

As with "collaboration" and "partnership" some of this is again empty rhetoric. Schools with the most monstrous failure rates can pronounce their devotion to the education of "all" students without any sign of conscious hypocrisy whatever. Yet, as with "collaboration" and partnership," something is going on with this noticeable increase in emphasis on "success" and "all."

Some of the substance underlying this shift in terminology can be seen in the changing attitudes about drop-outs. For most of the history of public education the "dropout" of teenagers was not considered a problem. It was the natural thing for most people to do, with work in field and factory the natural way for them to continue their progress to productive adulthood. But in recent years there has been increasing concern, first that young people stay in school, and then, more recently, that they actually get at least a high school education in order to equip themselves for adult responsibilities.

Some of the shift to success-for-all can be attributed to one of the few examples in recent times of American educational policy looking abroad for examples to follow. In this case it is the Japanese example that has caught the imagination of the American people. Their single-minded commitment to make sure that all their young people are equipped to fulfill their responsibilities as adults--and to fulfill them at a high level of excellence—is seen by an increasing number of American policy-makers as a major component of Japanese economic success, and since "the business of America is business," the threat of Japanese economic superiority has finally awakened the American body politic to the shallowness of our commitment to education.

Ironically, it is possible that the success of Japanese education, in addition to its many roots in admirable qualities of Japanese culture, has come in part from their taking seriously the slogans of American "universal public education" when they shifted to a democratic system after the war. Perhaps they didn't understand that we really were only committed to universal schooling, not universal education. Thanks to their example we are now beginning to see the difference, and we are waking up to the need to really educate all our children, instead of just keeping them in school.

In my view, this is an exceedingly important shift. It is by no means yet complete even in people's minds, let alone in practice. But it represents a radical break with the past--a paradigm-shift type "revolution" in thinking and mindsets, with all sorts of consequences for educational policy and practice. It is not just a change of degree--we want more children educated to higher levels than before. It represents a shift of education from being a "winners and losers" game, with all the psychology, behavior, pedagogy, testing, etc. that accompanies such a paradigm, to a "success for all" or win-win game, with the very different psychology, behavior, pedagogy, testing, etc. that would have to accompany this type of human enterprise.

What else are our present testing, tracking, and grading practices than the application of a "winners and losers" paradigm to the school house? The fact that it is a familiar concept from sports and business competition--and a very American concept at that--is probably one of the reasons it was installed so readily into our educational paradigm--and why it is so hard to remove. It was not just the invention of wrong-headed educators, but a true translation of dominant American values into the public school system.

And, indeed, "success for all" still sounds unrealistic, if not subversive and socialistic to many Americans both in the teaching profession and out. It is so far outside our well-entrenched educational mindsets that many people cannot even conceive of what is being talked about. They treat it as empty rhetoric or altogether meaningless. And indeed they are right from the point of view of the prevailing winners-and-losers paradigm, since within this paradigm there have to be losers, and therefore "success for all" is literally inconceivable. Or they treat it as a proposal for "lowering standards," since from the point of view of the "winners-and-losers" paradigm, where there must be losers, the assumption is that "success-for-all" must therefore be merely a scheme to call the losers "winners" (i.e. pass failing students just so they can be called winners). They can't grasp that what is involved is a whole different assumption: the idea of making sure that children actually succeed in learning what they need--that failure would not be tolerated. This seems so far from present reality or even possibility in many schools as again to be inconceivable.

What is at stake, therefore, as in other paradigm shifts, is not whether success for all makes sense within a winners-and-losers paradigm, but whether we should abandon the winners-and-losers paradigm itself.

No one can "prove" to a person who holds to the winners-and-losers paradigm that it is "incorrect," any more than Columbus could prove to a person who firmly held to the flat earth concept that he was wrong, or that we can prove to a person who can only conceive of organization through the bureaucratic paradigm that partnership is better. It is in the nature of paradigms that people who won't give them up can't change to new ones, since they judge the new paradigms through the principles of the paradigms they hold.

But what is happening with the "winners and losers" paradigm in education is that an increasing number of people are beginning to consider giving it up. However comfortable a component of our belief system it has been in the past, people are beginning to realize that in today's world losers in school are likely to be losers in life, and as a result are likely to be unproductive and dangerous to themselves and to society. Hence the concern about dropouts, "children at risk," "the forgotten-half," etc.

So I believe a significant paradigm shift is underway away from the winners-and-losers paradigm and toward some sort of success-for-all paradigm, but it is still mostly unconscious and not recognized as a paradigm shift--and it is therefore not yet having as much effect as it should. The increased concern is there, and all sorts of programs and projects have been launched to meet the concern. But what has not been sufficiently recognized is the significant change in assumptions these efforts imply, and therefore the significant change that will be required in mindsets, old habits, institutional arrangements, etc. to make the success-for-all concept operationally successful. The exceptions to this, such as the "Comer," "Accelerated" (Levin), and "Essential" (Sizer) schools, prove the rule: They are very rare and very different from the standard public schools, and one of the differences is a <u>conscious</u> effort to break away from the winners-and-losers mindset and to embrace a success-for-all outlook.

The failure to do this in most schools and even in most programs supposedly designed for "at risk" children, is a major reason why many of them fail. Many anti-dropout projects, for instance, fail not because they don't involve a lot of effort and resources, but because the mindsets of most the participants--not only the staff hired to corral the kids and stuff them back in school, but the staff who is there to receive them when they return, and the kids themselves and their parents and peers--are all still operating on a winners-and-losers paradigm, and the kids are seen--and see themselves--as losers. Only when we realize that we are dealing with basic assumptions, belief systems, and mindsets are we likely to undertake the kind of coordinated change of program and practice and re-orientation of

staff, students, parents and community that will be needed to make such efforts successful.

The trend toward "success-for-all" thinking therefore should be pulled out of its present sub- or semi-conscious state and recognized for what it is--a true paradigm shift, and evaluated as such. Some may argue that it is too vague to serve as the new basic goal paradigm. Fred Newmann, of instance, in an excellent article in the February, 1991 Phi Delta Kappan, argues forcefully that "There is no reason to believe that restructuring will produce favorable results for students unless plans for new structures are guided by a vision of educational outcomes" that includes "authentic achievement," i.e. real understanding and ability to think, rather than merely mastery of "the current curriculum." [45] I agree with almost everything in this article, except for one thing: it's implication that the splendid concepts he espouses must be part of the new basic paradigm for public education in order for it to "work" in helping policy-makers, educators, parents, and students shift from reforming to transforming our failing public school system.

When it comes to an individual school-site planning council trying to figure out how to transform its school, I would be right by Newmann's side arguing for "authentic achievement" as the new goal for the school. But the crisis we're in at present is that very few schools are even trying to transform themselves at all. If we wait until there is sufficient consensus on "new standards for student achievement" at the level of specificity and sophistication Newmann calls for, we will not even get into the process of restructuring for years to come.

"Success-for-all," vague as it sounds, is a radical and powerful paradigm if taken seriously. There are so many children who are not succeeding by any reasonable standards for today's world, that I am convinced that even if there is considerable uncertainty or disagreement about the definition of full success, most groups of people today trying to come up with enough common definition to enable them to implement a success-for-all policy will find they have to transform their school to achieve their common goal.

Many of them would be moving in the direction of Newmann's vision anyway if they take success-for-all seriously in relation to the needs of today's world. But, even if a school didn't lift its sights above teaching and learning "the current curriculum," but applied this commitment to all children, they would be on the road to significant restructuring. The key is shifting gears out of the winners-and-losers and into the success-for-all mindset. Once people have made this basic shift, then there is all sorts of room (and need and opportunity) for trying to reach agreement on what "success" might mean, and for arguing for excellent goals such as Newmann advocates.

Indeed, groups such as the National Council of Teachers of English and the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics have already been doing some excellent work along these lines in recent years. Such refinement and improvement in the definition of "success" can be seen as analogous to the development of "normal science" in the sciences, i.e. improving and extending knowledge within the framework of a new paradigm. But without that basic paradigm shift to a success-for-all goal, all such work is likely to be implemented within the old paradigm and merely be a further way for separating winners from losers.

Partnership and Success-for-All as a Dual Shift

Looking at the shift to "success-for-all" as a paradigm-shift rather than just a new goal within the old paradigm, is also important for another reason: I am convinced that this shift in our goal paradigm is integrally related to the shift in our process paradigm from bureaucracy to partnership. The "success-for-all" and partnership concepts fit together in a single "matrix" that is much more powerful as a new paradigm--with more chance of winning converts and working in practice--than either of them alone.

Indeed, strong as each of the trends is in its own right, neither of them is sufficient, standing alone, to work as a successful new paradigm for public education, i.e. to "solve our problems" and provide the conceptual basis for successful school restructuring in the '90's:

Partnershiop is not sufficient because, by itself, it has no goal. Conceiving of the relationship of teachers, students, parents, etc. in terms of shared responsibility, voice, choice and loyalty, teaming, etc., instead of delegation to government and bureaucratic service delivery, will help us do many things in education much better; but it will not produce the new level of education for all children now needed if this new goal is not in the minds of the people who are choosing, voicing, sharing responsibility, collaborating, etc.

Even more important, there is no need to take all the trouble to shift to a new process paradigm so long as the old goal paradigm remains in effect. The bureaucratic/service delivery paradigm has served quite well for producing "winners and losers" (especially when the traditional social and racial stereotypes are added to the mindset matrix, since then just the "right" children are coming out the losers). So long as the winners-and-losers paradigm prevails, there is no "crisis" requiring a paradigm shift in the way we conceive of the educational process. It is only when we begin to shift to a radically different mindset about results, such as "success-for-all," that we confront a "crisis" requiring reexamination of the structure of relationships in the schooling process.

Likewise, a "success-for-all" paradigm by itself is insufficient. It will seem, and has seemed—and in fact is—"unrealistic" (i.e. not to be considered seriously as part of one's operating assumptions) so long as we hold to the present bureaucratic/service delivery educational paradigm. Can anyone really imagine successfully educating the millions of children now failing in our public schools if we persist in maintaining a system that is so ineffective in mobilizing the motivation and problem-solving collaboration of its participants? Within the "world view" of the old paradigm, "success for all" must be seen as more or less meaningless, pie-in-the sky rhetoric—which, of course, very nicely matches with how it is seen from the point of view of the winners-and-losers goal paradigm.

On the other hand, When you put the success-for-all goal paradigm together with the partnership or collaboration process paradigm, as part of a unified integrated whole, you begin to get a coherent picture that makes sense. People may still not understand it or want to consider it because they are not looking for a new paradigm; or, if they are looking for one, they may not agree with this one. And even if they agree with it, they may have a hard time adjusting to it, and an even harder time changing all the institutional habits, procedures and practices that are built on the old paradigm matrix. But at least it can be talked about and considered as an alternative paradigm that makes sense conceptually.

Furthermore, it is sufficiently coherent to be put to use, and indeed is being used in such pioneering efforts as James Comer's "Comer Process" schools, Levin's Accelerated Schools, Ted Sizer's Essential Schools, and many other laudable individual efforts. It therefore can take on concrete meaning so people can begin to see and feel what it is like in practice. Teachers can sense the difference between accepting student failure (because it was never made clear that it was unacceptable and because they could see no alternative within the isolated, bureaucratic, egg-crate school), and, on the other hand, working with their colleagues, other students, parents and community resources to help each child succeed. Students can sense what it's like to be an integral part of a social group whose shared goal is everyone's educational success, and in which all members support and hold each other accountable for promoting that success. Parents can sense the empowerment and responsibility of sharing responsibility for student success. Citizens can sense the rewards (as well as the burdens) of helping children become educated instead of just complaining about their failure. Etc.

It is this combination of "success for all" and partnership, I believe, which is at the heart of the "seismic" paradigm shift sensed by Finn, because it is this combination which creates the mindset that sees a child's failure as an occasion for the joint effort of all parties to assure success. instead of the complacency, mutual blame-placing, or ineffectual efforts to increase the "delivery of services" that characterize so much of our present response to school failure.

There are many other important problems to be worked out in changing our "matrix" of mindsets, assumptions, and practices about teaching, curriculum, testing, accountability, teacher education (as well as parent and administrator education), race, class, and gender, parent involvement, etc.--not to mention sharper definitions of "success" and the working out of the best combinations of voice and choice. But these "problems" or "puzzles" all will "look different" and have more chance of being "solved" in a productive manner if we get these two basic elements of the new paradigm right. As Kuhn points out, after a paradigm shift, people "are responding to a different world." [46]

For example, as pointed out in Education Through Partnership, the new paradigm calls for redefinition of the roles of the key participants: Students are seen as the primary "workers" instead of the "targets" of "instructional delivery"; teachers are seen as leaders instead of low level bureaucratic functionaries; principals are seen as leaders of leaders instead of bosses of teachers; and parents are seen as essential partners instead of merely taxpayers, voters and caretakers of their children. [47] The focus shifts from teaching to learning, since as Joe Carroll points out in connection with his new paradigm Copernican Plan , "what is important in education is not how we teach but how students learn--for absolutely nothing has happened in education until it happens to a student." [48] This in turn will provide the agenda for all collaborative and partnership activities: how can each student be helped to become a successful learner, and how can the school be changed in whatever way is needed to make sure that all children become successful learners?

Any educational policy-making group can use this new paradigm to help clarify what restructuring is all about--at the school, district, state, national and even international levels--and to work out the implications of this "different world" in the realities of their particular context. This is in fact how the new paradigm will ultimately take shape and take hold in the real life and behavior of teachers, students, parents, administrators, and citizens.

Luckily, as we've seen, a new paradigm need not be perfect to be used. The model Copernicus proposed for the solar system had to be improved by Kepler and Newton, and Columbus' model for the round earth had to be modified considerably by later navigators. But they both "worked" even in their imperfect form to enable people to set off in new directions, undertake new actions, develop new mindsets, and, indeed, to perfect and improve the new paradigms that got the whole new process going. The above double conceptual shift, and all the related changes in educational practice that can accompany it, may not yet be worked out to perfection as an integrated, self-consistent "matrix" of beliefs, premises, and formulas. But it is sufficiently clear and different from the present paradigm to help us change the basic direction of a public education system that can no longer solve its problems but has so far proved resistant to change.

For the time being, therefore—with the greatest trepidation about the problem of meanings (and until a better formulation comes along)--I nominate the following as a "banner around which to rally":

EDUCATION FOR ALL THROUGH THE COLLABORATION OF ALL

Neither this verbal formula, nor any other simple formula or "banner" will connote to everyone the basic double-paradigm shift that has been set forth in this essay. But with the discussion that now must be escalated about finding a new basic conceptual model for public education, and with pioneering educators actually using something like this paradigm (as an increasing number are, even if they haven't put this label on it), there is increasing chance that something along the lines of the above "banner" can help us clarify, strengthen, and speed up the restructuring movement.

END

April, 1991

footnotes

Title: I am indebted to one of my students, Gayle Merrefield, for suggesting the main title, "Brother, Can You Paradigm?"

1. Thomas S. Kuhn, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*,2nd ed. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970), pp. 174-175.

2. *ibid.*, pp. 109-112. Kuhn speaks of a "revolution" in scientific thinking (i.e. a paradigm shift) as "a special sort of change involving a certain sort of reconstruction of group commitments" among the people in the particular field. (p.181).

3. *ibid.* p. 209.

4. Marilyn Ferguson, *The Aquarian Conspiracy* (Los Angeles: J.P. Tarcher, Inc., 1980), p. 26.

5. *ibid.* p. 26.

6. National Commission on Excellence in Education, *A Nation At Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform*, reprinted in *Education Week*, April 27, 1983, pp. 12-16.

7. Cf. for alternate view: Karl Weick, *The Social Psychology of Organizing* (Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1979): "It's okay not to know where you're going as long as you're going somewhere. Sooner or later you'll know where that somewhere is." (p. 246).

8. Fred M. Hechinger, "About Education," *New York Times*, 12/7/88, p. B 17.

9. Kuhn, *op. cit.*, pp. 150-151.

10. David L. Clark, "Emerging Paradigms in Organizational Theory and Research," in Yvonna Lincoln, ed. *Organizational Theory and Inquiry: The Paradigm Revolution* (Beverly Hills, CA: Sage, 1985), p. 69.

11. David S. Seeley, "Is Choice-Alone the Best Solution for Public Education?," *Future Choices*, Fall, 1990, pp.67-70. For a fuller discussion of this, see, David S. Seeley, *Education Through Partnership* (Cambridge: Ballinger, 1981; reprinted in paperback, 1985, available through University Press of America, Lanham, MD), pp. 83-92, 133-156.

12. Seeley, *Education Through Partnership*, pp. 148-156.

13. Seymour Sarason, *Schooling in America: Scapegoat or Salvation* (New York: Free Press, 1983), p. 6.

14. *ibid.* pp. 7,5.

15. *ibid.* pp. 7,8.

16. Chester E. Finn, Jr., "The Biggest Reform of All," *Phi Delta Kappan*, April, 1990, pp. 585,589,586.

17. *ibid.* p. 586.

18. *ibid.* p. 586.

19. *ibid.* p. 589.

20. *ibid.* p. 588.

21. David L. Clark, *op. cit.* pp. 68,69.

22. Cf. internal memos by this author (then Assistant U.S. Commissioner of Education) on the Coleman study prior to its publication: to U.S. Commissioner of Education, Francis Keppel, July 1, 1965; to Alexander Mood, Assistant Commissioner, National Center for Educational Statistics, June 2 & June 16, 1966; and to Executive Group, June 7, 1966. (available from author)

23. In 1979, Coleman himself repudiated the conclusion that his 1966 Equal Education Opportunity survey demonstrated that schools can have little effect on children's learning: "The notion that schools can't help poor children overcome the effects of their family background was buried last week. Shoveling it under were sociologist James Coleman, whose massive report 13 years ago is often used in arguments that schools have little effect on children, and Ron Edmonds, senior assistant to the chancellor of the New York City schools and responsible for instruction in a system with more poor children than any other in the country. Holding the wake was the Public Education Assn. (PEA), an 84-year-old advocacy group that has always supported the city's public schools and is now campaigning for 'competency for all.' . . . . . Sifting through his own and the research of others and narrowing them down, Coleman 'set the record straight' on the interpretation of his report."-- "Schools Know How to Overcome Family Background, Research Shows," *Education USA*, 11/5/1979, p. 1.

24. Seeley, *Education Through Partnership*, pp. 3, 7-60.

25. *ibid.* pp. 3-5,22,26,68. Cf. also. Seeley, "Education: the undeliverable merchandise," *Daily News*, August 3, 1979, p. 32.

26. Seeley, *Education Through Partnership*, pp. 59, 47, 5.

27. *ibid*, p. 27.

28. Albert O. Hirschman, *Exit, Voice, and Loyalty* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1970).

29. Seeley, *Education Through Partnership*, p. 64.

30. *ibid*, pp. 107-263.

31. Clark, *op. cit.*

32. Herbert J. Walberg, et. al., *We Can Rescue Our Children: The Cure for Chicago's Public School Crisis--With Lessons for the Rest of America* (Chicago: The Heartland Institute, 1988). William H. Clune & John H. Witte, eds, *Choice and Control in American Education, Volume 2: The Practice of Choice, Decentralization and School Restructuring* (Bristol, PA: The Falmer Press, 1990), Chapter 4, "Voice and Choice in Chicago."

33. Deborah Meier, "Choice Can Save Public Education," *The Nation*, 3/4/91.

34. David S. Seeley, John H. Niemeyer & Richard Greenspan, *Principals Speak--Report #1: Restructuring Schools/School Leadership* (New York, CUNY Research Foundation, 1990).

35. Cf., for example, Statement by the President and Governors (the "Summit" statement), *New York Times*, 10/1/89, p. E22.

36. Seeley, *Education Through Partnership*, p. 8

37. *ibid.*, p. 244.

38. *ibid.*, pp. 245,216.

39. Finn, *op. cit.*, p. 590.

40. Susan Ohanian, "Against 'Collaboration': Reading and Writing Are Not Social Acts," *Education Week*, 2/13/91, p. 40.

41. *Education Week*, 2/28/90. p. 27.

42. Committee for Economic Development, *Investing in Our Children* (New York: CED, 1985), p. xii.

43. *Education Week*, 3/8/89, p. 9.

44. *New York Times*, 10/1/89, p. E22. Also: David S. Seeley, "Toward A New Definition of Equal Education Opportunity," *Equity and Choice*, Fall, 1985, pp. 15-22.

45. Fred M. Newmann, "Linking Restructuring to Authentic Student Achievement," *Phi Delta Kappan*, February, 1991, pp. 458-463.

46. Kuhn, *op. cit.*, p. 111.

47. Seeley, *Education Through Partnership*, pp. 201-214.

48. Joseph M. Carroll, *The Copernican Plan: Restructuring The American High School* (Andover, MA: The Regional Laboratory, 1989).